REMARKS

In claims 1 and 11, Applicant has corrected the language as suggested by the Examiner relative to the Section 112 issues. New dependent claims 18-22 and new independent claim 23 have been added to more particularly define the invention methodology.

It is submitted that the Examiner's rejection of independent claims 1 and 11 under Section 102(b) as anticipated by Shihabi is not properly founded.

Shihabi, as shown in Figures 3a-3b, teaches a method and apparatus for symbol clock lock detection of an incoming coherent digital signal, which may include a Manchester coded signal. However, Shibabi's half-symbol integrations methodology does not maintain the sign (positive or negative) of the integrated values (elements 31 and 31' in the figures). Instead, Shihabi squares or takes the absolute value of the integration result - meaning of course that all resulting values will be positive. Thus, if for example the first half-symbol signal component value and the second half-symbol signal component value can be either +1 or -1, then in the invention methodology at hand the difference of the values will be either +2 or -2 (see Figure 3). Under the methodology of Shihabi, the two values +1 or -1 are squared or given their absolute value, meaning that the difference of the two values would always be 0 (of if added, the value would always be 2). Therefore, undertaking the required claim step of "generating a difference signal corresponding to the difference between the integrated values of the first and second half-symbol components" would have no value under Shihabi to "determine the logic value of the unit bit cell".

In addition, Shihabi's integration is not synchronized to the symbol boundaries. Therefore, Shihabi cannot determine the logic value of a received <u>unit</u> bit cell - it can only make a lock decision based on a plurality "M" of symbols.

As set forth more fully in MPEP 2131, "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference". *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). Furthermore, "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim". *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). Furthermore, there is no enabling disclosure in Shihabi that would produce the desired result set forth this application.

The similarity between Shihabi and the claimed invention ends after Shihabi's first step - that of integrating (element 30 in the figures). Post-integration, Shihabi does not perform a calculation to determine the logic value of athe unit bit cell. Post-integration, Shihabi immediately discards the sign of the integrated result. There is nothing disclosed in Shihabi that would even make obvious the invention as claimed under Section 103, much less anticipate it under Section 102.

It is respectfully submitted that the claims as now presented are patentable, on the basis of the above remarks, and reconsideration and subsequent passage for allowance is hereby requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas C. Saitta, Reg. No. 32102
Attorney for Applicant

Rogers Towers, P.A.
1301 Riverplace Blvd.
Suite 1500
Jacksonville, FL 32207
904-346-5518
904-396-0663 (fax)